DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 806 UD 013 140

AUTHOR	Goldberg, Gertrude S.; And Others
TITLE	Public-Service Employment: A Poorly Publicized Opportunity; Title IV in the 60's. IRCD Bulletin, Volume 8, Numbers 3 and 4, May-September 1972.
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	16p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Community Services; *Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; Human Services; Inservice Teacher Education; *Integration Methods; Problem Solving; *Program Evaluation; *Public Support; School Integration; Social Change; Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title IV; Emergency Employment Act of 1971; ESEA Title IV

ABSTRACT

The first section of this issue of the Bulletin has to do with public service employment, a poorly understood social policy which must be defined before it can be evaluated as an anti-poverty strategy. The term public service employment (PSE) refers to the policy of using government funds to create jobs which serve a dual purpose: that of (1) providing paid employment for those unable to find work in the private sector of the economy, and (2) expanding vital services to people. Promising but surprisingly unnoticed legislative proposals seek to broaden, expand, or extend the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. The major criteria for evaluating PSE proposals include permanence, size, hiring preferences for the disadvantaged, community participation, and potential for upgrading. The second section is a digest of a longer report, "A Survey of Inservice Education Workshops." To understand past practices in inservice desegregation workshops, the authors examined a large body of Title IV, E.S.E.A. workshop reports. These workshop reports offer a body of knowledge about the design and effectiveness of holding small-group learning experiences to deal with the multiple and complex intellectual and human relation problems of school desegregation in an atmosphere of social change. (Authors/JM)

ED 070806

IRCD BULLETIN

PUBLICATION OF THE ERIC INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER ON THE DISADVANTAGED

Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute • Teachers College • Columbia University
525 West 120 Street, N. Y., N. Y. 10027

Volume VIII, Nos. 3 and 4 May-September, 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD013140

This **Bulletin** was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TITLE IV IN THE 60's*

Erwin Flaxman and Doris Mosley**

Sec. 404. The Commissioner is authorized to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation of short-term or regular session institutes for special training designed to improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors, and other elementary or secondary school personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation.

Sec. 405. (a) The Commissioner is authorized, upon application of a school board, to make grants to such board to pay, in whole or in part, the cost of–

(1) giving to teachers and other school personnel inservice training in dealing with problems incident to desegregation, and

(2) employing specialists to advise in problems incident to desegregation.

(Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV)

Faced with the complex problems of school desegregation, the Federal Government has readily provided financial support for inservice education of school personnel. Through Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 it has committed itself to inservice education as a machinery for reeducating school personnel to plan curriculum and instruction for minority or

(continued on next page)

*This paper is a digest of a longer report, *A Survey of Inservice Education Workshops*, developed under Contract No. OEC-O-9-4200088-2327 (Project No. 1-0296) between ERIC/IRCD and the Division of Practice Improvement of the National Center of Educational Communication, formerly of the U.S. Office of Education, now the Dissemination Task Force of the National Institute of Education (DHEW). A complete version is available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Leasco Information Products (LIPCO), P.O. Box O, Bethesda, Maryland 20014 for $3.29 in paper form, $0.65 in microfiche form. Order No. ED 065 737.

Mr. Flaxman is Associate Director of ERIC/IRCD; **Dr. Mosley has been a Research Associate with ERIC and the National Center for Research and Information on Equal Educational Opportunity (NCRIEEO) at Teachers College.

PUBLIC-SERVICE EMPLOYMENT: A POORLY PUBLICIZED OPPORTUNITY

Gertrude S. Goldberg*

Public service employment is a poorly understood social policy which must be defined before it can be evaluated as an anti-poverty strategy. The term public service employment (PSE) refers to the policy of using government funds to create jobs which serve a dual social purpose: that of (1) providing paid employment for those unable to find work in the private sector of the economy and (2) expanding vital services to people. The actual work setting for PSE may be voluntary nonprofit organizations; Federal, State or local government agencies; or, less frequently, private enterprise. The important factor, however, is that the monies for wages and other expenses are paid for mostly by the level of government that sponsors the PSE program and not necessarily by the employing agency. The difference between these PSE jobs and existing government employment is that they are created with the explicit purpose of providing jobs as well as meeting the needs of the general public. On the other hand, PSE differs from ordinary work relief in that it is not conceived of as made-work but as necessary service.

PSE and the War on Poverty

Public service employment is an anti-poverty policy that was conspicuously absent from the nation's War on Poverty. It is true that poor people worked as human-service aides in many anti-poverty programs, but they were employed mainly to make these services more acceptable to disadvantaged clientele. By contrast, PSE is an effort by government to create jobs as well as to enhance human services. As such it fulfills both the employment and the service needs of society.

Perhaps because they were enacted during a period of relatively full employment, anti-poverty programs sought to improve the future earning power of the poor rather than simply to put them to work. In the War on Poverty, "economic opportunity" meant educating and training prospective workers–not creating jobs. However, as we shall show, job expansion is needed to prevent poverty in good times as well as bad.

(continued on page 11)

*Gertrude S. Goldberg is a Scholar in Residence at ERIC-IRCD. She is a social worker who has specialized in the fields of social policy and community organization and is also an instructor in the Division of Health Services, Sciences and Education at Teachers College, Columbia University.

economically or educationally disadvantaged children and to confront the tensions of social differences between students and faculty brought on by school desegregation. Like most organizations, the Government believes that men can be educated into accepting changes they may otherwise resist; it has supported the civil rights laws, judicial decisions, and administrative fiats of the 1960's with funds for massive training programs to bring about the attitudinal and behavioral changes which could make school desegregation work.

That universities and school districts eagerly used Federal money to hold workshops, seminars, institutes, training programs, and conferences on the problems of school desegregation is not very surprising. There is a sizable body of research and a tradition of practice that suggests that instruction and attitude and behavior change can be brought about through inservice workshops.* For at least ten years prior to the concentrated school desegregation efforts of the 1960's, schools had been using workshop methods to train teachers to use new techniques and materials. It was inevitable that workshops would be chosen as a machinery to train personnel dealing with the "methods and materials" of school desegregation. Held continually since 1964, they have adopted many of the techniques of small-group learning and have added to them lectures, demonstration teaching experience, community field visits, etc. Seemingly, every traditional learning method has been used to confront the massive problems of school desegregation.

To understand past practices in inservice desegregation workshops, the authors have examined a large body of Title IV workshop reports. These workshop reports offer a body of knowledge about the design and effectiveness of holding small-group learning experiences to deal with the multiple and complex intellectual and human relation problems of school desegregation in an atmosphere of social change. This retrospective survey has been conducted to help administrators and other program planners in the planning, implementing, and evaluating of inservice workshops by pointing to the critical variables in workshop success, judging from their past successes and failures.

Description of the Survey

The description and evaluation of Title IV desegregation workshops in this survey is the product of an analysis of reports found in the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), a national information retrieval network, and in the document collections of the Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged and the National Center for Research and Information on Equal Educational Opportunity, both housed at Teachers College, Columbia University. The Title IV workshop reports constitute the most complete record of inservice attempts to deal with the educational problems of school desegregation in the last half of the 1960's that is now available. More than 300 reports were available, and 80 were used to produce data. A workshop was considered "positive," "typical," or "negative" depending on how closely it met the following general criteria:

1. Realistic objectives, achievable within the time and circumstances of the workshop.
2. Carefully articulated workshop planning procedures, including the screening of participants.
3. Participant input into the planning of the workshop.
4. Clear and appropriate program design, given the time and circumstances of the workshop; the use of appropriate methods of materials for achieving the objectives; the overall intellectual quality of the workshop content.
5. Full evaluation (including appropriate subjective and objective measures) revealing participant reactions, progress toward achieving objectives, and strengths and weaknesses of workshop procedure and design; participant and staff evaluation of training staff.
6. Consistency among objectives, design, and evaluation.
7. Planning or implementation for follow-up to determine improvement in the school situation as a result of the workshop.
8. Planning or implementation for disseminating workshop outcomes and materials.

Despite the effort to distinguish differences among positive, typical, and negative programs, the workshops differed only in degree of success in meeting the survey criteria. What is more, there were gaps in the reports themselves; all too often there was insufficient information about what actually occurred in the planning and implementation of these workshops to make valid judgments about success or failure *according to any criteria.* It is likely that the reports were written by workshop planners or directors in haste, for the most part to meet contractual obligations, but as is the case in reporting other social action efforts, the result is a body of incomplete and unclear data which must be used in making intellectual and policy decisions about continuing or changing past practices.

Critical Variables in Workshop Success

Several features of the workshops are significant enough to examine more closely. What follows is not a condemnation or stamp of approval of past Title IV workshop practices. Our aim is not to comment on the overall success of these workshops–for the most part this can only be speculation since the reports lack important data–but rather to isolate critical variables in workshop success, many of which workshop planners themselves have identified, so that there will be a greater recognition of the elements involved in workshop planning and implementation.

Planning

Most Title IV workshops seemed to have been planned in the minds of the organizers and "benevolently imposed" on the participants. Despite the emphasis in the workshop activities on improving communication among educators, students, and community, putting together the workshop was exclusively the task of someone away from the problem the workshop would deal with. The result, it seems, was that participants were often more knowledgeable about the workshop problem than the planners and their training staff,

*The term *workshop* will be used generically throughout this paper to apply to the various forms of small-group learning structures.

having been, as they often put it, "on the firing line," while the workshop leaders merely speculated about the problem. Of course, being somewhat removed from an immediate problem frequently allowed for a wider perspective, and the many university personnel who planned desegregation workshops were likely knowledgeable about the problems of desegregation and keen observers of school problems, but without conducting some field research they could not actually know the dimensions of the problems they were planning workshops to solve. Ideas for workshops can rarely be the participants', given the way workshops are funded; thus, it would seem essential that planners conduct some field research to be better acquainted with the local problems of the workshop participants.

Selection of Participants

A careful field analysis of local needs can also guarantee that the individuals who participate in workshops are those who should. Too many workshop reports pointed out that the participants were not always those who could most profit from the workshop; in some cases the participants were openly resistant to the workshop activities. (One workshop director stated that his participants so seriously lacked problem solving and critical thinking skills that his program of research and discussion of desegregation problems was consistently thwarted; the participating teachers thought that the workshop would give them hard and exact information about how to teach and how to manage their classrooms, and thus they were always at odds with the training staff about the goals of the workshop.) Workshop planners recognized the need to more carefully establish criteria for attendance at the outset in order to carefully screen out undesirable participants. But this realization came at the end of the workshop, after failures because of a poor choice of participants. In some cases, however, delays in funding made screening impossible; often a workshop had to be put together in a few weeks with whoever was available. Held under less hurried conditions, however, it would seem that workshop planners could use screening criteria to insure that the participants would be amenable to the program. On the other hand, keeping out participants who should attend perhaps might be more serious than bringing in those who should not. School personnel having the greatest difficulty do not always seek help, especially older teachers and principals concerned about their status, and school boards for the sake of their own image seem to send school personnel who positively reflect the school district. Here again a few visits to a school could help identify those individuals who could profit from a workshop experience, who might not have volunteered, nor have been asked to participate.

A serious deficiency of many workshops was the absence of non-school people among the workshop participants. Workshops which dealt with the community conflict surrounding school desegregation, for example, limited themselves to bringing in community spokesmen to lecture to school personnel but had no community people participating as well. One striking exception was a six-week desegregation workshop in the Northwest, which for the most part wanted to improve the skills of teachers working with disadvantaged youth, but also attempted to develop an increased understanding of the dynamics of institutional change at the community level. Workshop planners invited teachers, principals, college professors and students, educational consultants, civil rights workers, ministers, parents, barbers, union representatives, and Job Corps trainees to come as participants. The apparent success of this workshop might have been due to the heterogeneous mix of the participants: dealing with community in the flesh is likely to be a richer learning experience than dealing with community in the word.

Objectives

The potential for workshop success can be determined at the outset by its objectives. Most Title IV inservice workshops had unachievable objectives, judging from the way they are outlined in the reports, even in the six-week period of some workshops, let alone in the two or three days of many others. In some cases there was no difference in the stated objectives of the workshops, despite their differences in duration and intensity, magnitude, etc. There seemed to be an inability to conceptualize objectives that can be translated into cognitive or behavioral goals; for the most part, planners seemed to feel that a workshop could right every educational wrong, but this meant that goals which could be reached were ignored in the grandiose efforts of many workshop planners. It is possible that the reports of the workshops do not accurately state the workshops' objectives, that in the haste or pressures of planning, no care was taken in formulating or recording objectives, and that during the actual workshop, goals became clearer; but even if this were the case, the fact that there was no effort to state objectives in terms which could help in planning the content or activities of the workshop suggests that there was no clear notion of what it could accomplish in a circumscribed period of time. To many, these workshops could perform miracles, and any educational fad could be used to bring these marvels about.

The following list of the stated objectives of a 15-day workshop for elementary school teachers and counselors, sponsored by a Midwestern university, is an example:

1. *To develop the participants' ability to raise the level of mathematics, reading, and communication skills (including speech) in the integrated school environment.*
2. *To develop the participants' ability to appreciate the sociological, psychological, and economic characteristics developed in Negroes by their subjection to these stereotyped environmental influences.*
3. *To develop the participants' ability to overcome stereotyped ideas of race relations possessed by their students and develop an understanding of the problem involved.*
4. *To develop the participants' ability to guide and counsel students so that the individual student may be developed to the fullest potential.*

Looking at Objective #2, one is struck by the mammoth task of making non-blacks realize how blacks have been affected by stereotypes held about them. As stated, Objective #2 also suggests that the development of blacks has conformed to these stereotypes, and thus raises complex epistemological issues. Do non-blacks see blacks in stereotyped ways? Do these stereotypes actually fulfill themselves as blacks conform to them? Or do non-blacks only see what they want to see, regardless of what is actually the case? Or, do blacks realize that non-blacks will believe what they want to believe and thus

make no attempt to change it? Do blacks have stereotypes of non-black beliefs? In what way do stereotypes really affect attitudes and behavior? It may well be that the workshop planners meant only to inform the workshop participants of some of the social characteristics of blacks, using objective scientific data and field observation, and thus challenge the participants to examine their stereotypes, but the objective as stated suggests a much more complex problem which could never be handled in a workshop of any length and probably requires a great deal of study and self-examination before one could seriously confront it. A great deal had to be accomplished in the brief time of this workshop; it is likely that little serious sustained attention could be given to the nature of stereotypes in any case.

Design

The most critical factor in workshop success seems to be a match between the objectives and the activities. In many of the reports of the Title IV workshops, however, there was little indication that content and activities were chosen with the objectives clearly in mind; in some cases, for example, no distinction was made between activities for improving interpersonal skills and those for upgrading teaching techniques. Most workshops consisted of lectures, small group discussions, and social activities, regardless of the objectives. Role-playing techniques, for example, work best in workshops where the resolution of conflict among school personnel is the objective of the workshop; if a desegregation problem does not result from conflict in the school, role-playing is a useless workshop strategy and may even cloud efforts to find a better solution to the problem at hand. Sensitivity training, which is becoming popular, tends to challenge social roles, and if the goal of a workshop is greater effectiveness for the teacher in fulfilling her role as teacher, then her "real" feelings may be irrelevant. The workshop activity clearly must be a function of the objectives and goals of the workshop.

Careful planning and formulation of workshop objectives can suggest the appropriate activities. The previously discussed workshop in the Northwest was planned to show that *de facto* school segregation can be reduced by greater understanding of community structure and conflict. The specific workshop objectives were:

1. Increased understanding of the dynamics of institutional change at the community level.
2. Greater familiarity with strategies for the resolution of community conflict.
3. Greater familiarity with case histories of desegregation.

The participants attended a political science seminar in order to actually learn about the dynamics of community structure and to obtain the necessary skills to analyze their own community. One must assume that the planners felt that giving the participants a greater repertoire of analytical skills and information was more important than their merely acting out particular roles, for example.

In an attendant problem area, the improvement of teaching strategies for working with the disadvantaged, the planners established the following objectives:

1. Better conceptual understanding of the black subculture and its differences from other ethnic subcultures in family structure, community organization, etc.
2. Better understanding of the perspectives of disadvantaged youth.
3. Better understanding of the use of special teaching materials.
4. Better understanding of the effects and use of teacher aides in the classroom.
5. Better understanding of the value of innovative scheduling and curriculum.

Again two seminars were held, one on the black subculture and the other on teaching techniques, with panel discussions and personal consultation with welfare mothers and Job Corps youth. There was also small group work in which participants prepared group term papers which were presented for critique by the larger group, and each participant had to develop his own specific teaching strategies and materials and had to prepare action blueprints. Although the activities clearly were based on traditional classroom approaches to learning, the workshop had a sense of urgency because many of the participants were actively involved in the community; thus the intellectual discussions were not carried on in a vacuum.

Regardless of one's opinion of the overall effectiveness of such approaches to learning, this workshop planned and carried out activities which met the articulated objectives of greater intellectual understanding of the complex problems of school desegregation. This match suggests that the workshop may have been quite successful. Significantly, in evaluating it, plans were made to test the amount of intellectual content that the participants retained; thus evaluation was also in terms of the workshop objectives.

Evaluation

Evaluative techniques and efforts in Title IV workshops were such that one cannot accurately say that a particular workshop was a success or failure. This is so for a number of reasons: most workshops had no clear objectives to evaluate; pre- and post-attitude testing (or any kind of attitude testing) was done in relatively few of the programs, although some of these few programs used as many as six non-staff (perhaps standardized) attitude surveys. (Few of these instruments were included in the reports, so it is difficult to comment on their quality.) Evaluation of any sort is hard for people who are not trained in testing and measurement. But why simple techniques, like attitude testing (even with its disadvantages), videotaping, and demonstration teaching with group evaluation, were not more widely used is not clear. These techniques, and simple narrative reports of observation, yield respectable objective and subjective data about human behavior, which can be simply used in the absence of more refined techniques. What is critical is that there is some feedback, no matter how rudimentary, on the ways in which participants were affected by the workshop. Workshop planners also have the obligation to evaluate their own workshop practices, their own planning and implementation.

Follow-up and Dissemination

Follow-up contacts were planned by nearly all workshops but seemed to vary widely in practice. Most programs had a one-time follow-up approximately three, six, or nine months after the original workshop, although there were few classroom observations of participants, and thus there is little

firm evidence of behavioral change as a result of the workshop. Often educational administrators (rather than participating teachers) gave information about differences in school districts following a workshop. In some instances, follow-up was difficult to arrange and was dropped. One program, however, designed nine or ten follow-up contacts with participants in the region. Each participant had developed an "action blueprint" which could be discussed with the visiting project staff. As the staff moved within the region they carried with them information from place to place, and each of the participants knew what his peer was doing to implement his action blueprint. However, there seemed to be no organized pattern or single follow-up technique which was potentially most successful. It is possible that funding limitations made any kind of follow-up difficult, but budget analyses were not included in most reports, so one cannot be sure. Whatever the reason, information about lasting changes in teacher behavior as a result of these workshops is limited.

Dissemination of information during or following workshops was virtually neglected by more than one half of the programs in the study, although many participants themselves expressed the desire for dissemination. Again, budgetary considerations could have hampered this effort. However, one major means of dissemination was the project report itself, which was in too many instances poorly organized and unclear. For purposes of plain information, there is an abysmal lack of solid narrative about Title IV workshops.

Some Observations and Recommendations

Our review of the successes and shortcomings of these Title IV workshops suggests that some practices are critical. We have alluded to them, but to be clear, we make several recommendations:

1. Workshop planners should conduct preliminary field research to determine the specific problems to be dealt within the workshop. Field research, as we consider it, consists of interviews, observations, and the reviewing of such data as students' records, newspapers, etc. Depending on the outcome of this field study, planners can appropriately design their workshops: formulate objectives, choose and screen participants and training staff, develop a program, consider evaluation techniques, etc. At the outset, a prototype of the workshop is created; thus, the implementation becomes more systematic.
2. Workshop planners should formulate realistic objectives which can lead to participants' behavioral change. To be realistic, they must be able to be met in the time of the workshop. Workshop planners snould articulate the philosophical assumptions on which their workshop is based, but should be careful that the objectives of the workshops are not based primarily on the staff's or the planner's philosophical position but rather on the behavioral needs of the participants.
3. In implementing the objectives, there should be an on-going review to guarantee that the workshop program is continually functioning to satisfy the objectives. There should be a capacity in the workshop design for altering the design if necessary.
4. Before, during, and after the workshop, planners should continually evaluate both the effect of the workshop on the participants and the quality of the workshop itself. Common sense and logical means of evaluation, such as empirical observation and narration of workshop events, would provide enough crude data to measure the effectiveness of the workshop.
5. If workshops are to improve, then practices must be better disseminated. Workshop planners should seek funds to repeat them in order to perfect a format that is related to the interests and problems of the schools. One way to deal with the financial problems of conducting a number of workshops is to train some participants during a workshop to be trainers at a future workshop; in this way the initial workshop has a built-in diffusion effect. Workshop planners must also take greater care in recording the workshop events; this is critical if knowledge of desegregation workshops is to be disseminated. With more accurate knowledge about past practices, future workshops would unquestionably improve.

Prototypes

The preceding analysis of Title IV workshops suggests that systematic planning is crucial to workshop success, no matter how exemplary individual practices might be. We propose the following models for planning and conducting a successful inservice desegregation workshop not to insist that these concerns are the most important in the desegregated school, but rather to suggest how at the outset a workshop can be planned to increase the potential for overall success.

Prototype I

Hypothetical Situation Teachers in a previously all-white high school have found that there are more discipline or classroom management problems in their classrooms since a group of low-income black children have been bussed into the school. Proposed solutions have failed, and teachers, parents, and students have become more anxious and tense. The teachers especially feel that they are not able to maintain control in their classes and bemoan the changes that school desegregation has brought about. A workshop in interpersonal relations is proposed as a solution.

Planning A field research committee consisting of a parent, a teacher, and the assistant principal interviews students, teachers, parents, and administrators to gather data on conflicts in the classrooms, and reviews the issues and events surrounding the decision to bus the black youth into the school. Their findings conclude that an interpersonal workshop would in truth help to reduce classroom tensions, and they submit a tentative outline for a design of the workshop. The field research team plus other teachers, administrators, and representatives from both the bussed and receiving communities constitute a workshop planning committee which develops a final format for the workshop and appoints the training staff. It is decided that the workshop participants will be teachers alone (no students or parents) because of their pivotal role in classroom management. Teachers having the most severe discipline problems are given first opportunity to participate, and are strongly encouraged to attend the workshop. Beginning young teachers are given the next opportunity to join, and then all others interested in joining the workshop.

Given the nature of the participants, the planning committee formulates the following workshop objectives: (1) increased understanding of the genesis of behavior problems common to desegregated classrooms and schools, and (2) increased competence in handling particular discipline problems. Three-and-one-half days of school time are planned for the workshop.

Design

Day 1. Participants meet in large and small groups.

a. Outline and discussion of the workshop objectives which suggest a pro-teacher, supportive approach to the change.

b. Brief addresses by speakers of both communities to give the participants a sense of the non-school environment of their students.

c. Small group discussion of the analysis of classroom problems conducted by the field research team.

Day 2. Participants choose to take part in one of four small group activities.

Group A continues the problem analysis of Day 1 but expands it by integrating reports of other research and observations which have been made available to them. The task of this group is to come up with a full analysis of the etiology and treatment of discipline problems endemic to their school.

Group B views and discusses videotapes and movies taken in their classrooms or elsewhere which suggest the ecology of the classroom, especially its relevance to classroom order. The task of this group is to isolate critical factors in the classroom environment and their effect on the relationship between teacher and student.

Group C role plays with each other and/or students invited to attend the second day of the workshop in situations which illustrate the conflict in the classrooms. The task of this group is to come up with an explanation of the affective responses of teachers, administrators, students, and parents to problems of discipline.

Group D visits parents or students in the community and spends time interviewing them to find out how they would like to deal with some of the tensions in the schools. The task of this group is to gather more data relevant to the problem and to test whether the perceptions of students and community are significant in finding solutions.

Day 3. Participants meet in small and large groups.

a. Each small group prepares a report or demonstration which is presented to the workshop participants in a large group meeting.

b. Based on these presentations, each participant develops a number of behavioral strategies that can be implemented in the schools.

Day 4. Participants meet in a large group.

a. Critical examination of other participants' behavioral strategies (efficacy, feasibility, sensitivity to "real" issues as perceived by the other participants, etc.).

b. On-the-spot evaluation of the workshop and announcement of plans for follow-up and dissemination.

The training staff for such a workshop ideally should consist of individuals trained as discussion leaders and in role-playing techniques. A few individuals should also be available as nonparticipant observers who can provide on-the-spot commentary on the overall direction of the workshop and record the events as they occur.

Evaluation and Follow-up Knowledge about whether the workshop intervention brought about the desired behavior change can be obtained in several ways:

1. At an appropriate time (3 or 6 months) after the workshop, the field research team could conduct another study of the overall situation in the schools to determine whether any positive change has occurred; thus, there would be pre- and post-workshop comparative data.
2. An inventory or checklist measuring teachers' *perceptions* of the causes and solutions to discipline problems could be administered to the participants before and after the workshop to determine whether they see the complex causes of classroom disorder.
3. Observations of teachers before and after the workshop could determine whether teachers have a greater behavioral repertory for dealing with behavior problems as a result of the workshop.
4. The capacity of teachers to formulate behavioral strategies and to make an effort to implement them in the classroom could be determined during the workshop and through on-the-spot interviews; the teachers' efforts, regardless of the ultimate success, would be a positive outcome of the workshop.

Dissemination

1. Videotapes and recordings of the workshop role-playing sessions and of the interviews in the community could be made and disseminated.
2. Tapes of interviews with the participants before, during, and after the workshop could be made and disseminated.
3. A narrative report of the workshop could be disseminated, particularly to surrounding school districts and to state and national information services.
4. The report could be analyzed locally to identify practices which can be imitated in future workshops in other schools. This type of dissemination would have the greatest impact.

Prototype II

Hypothetical Situation A group of teachers in several desegregated schools have found that their students are having learning problems that they feel unable to help them with. The

methods and materials they have used in the past no longer seem to work. Having some knowledge about individualized instruction methods, which they feel can be successful in teaching educationally disadvantaged children, they recommend that individualized instruction be instituted in their schools. The school district administrator agrees to investigate this possibility and makes available the time of a specialist in curriculum and instruction on his staff to conduct a study.

Planning The Curriculum and Instruction specialist and some interested teachers and principals interview teachers, observe classrooms, and gather student data to analyze the students' learning problems. This group agrees with the recommendation that individualized instruction methods and materials, with some changes in classroom structure, should be introduced in a few target schools as an experiment. The temporary committee agrees to stand and is given the task of gathering available information about individualized instruction and for drawing up a plan for a workshop to train teachers. The committee arrives at the following workshop objectives: (1) increased understanding of the concepts underlying the techniques of individualized instruction, (2) increased skills in planning and carrying out individualized instruction in the classroom, (3) recognition of conflicting feelings and personal pedagogical problems in using individualized instruction methods. (Despite the eagerness of some teachers, the committee feels that the radical change and challenge of switching teaching methods could present personal difficulties to the teacher, which should be dealt with at the outset; thus, meeting Objective #3 would be a goal of the workshop.) The workshop is open to all teachers in the target schools. It is decided that it should be held for a week of orientation in the use of the techniques before school begins, and one day every other week during the school year for inservice training.

Design During the week of orientation, in large and small groups varying in size or composition, the following activities take place:

1. Addresses by specialists and teachers who have had experience in the use of individualized instruction. The speakers do not hide the shortcomings of the technique or muffle negative reactions, but the addresses stress the positive aspects of individualized instruction to support the teachers' efforts.
2. Demonstration in the use of the techniques and materials and in models for classroom organization, preferably conducted in traditional classrooms and with the supplies and materials which the teacher will be using.
3. Analysis of videotapes showing successful and unsuccessful use of individualized instruction methods.
4. Examination of innovative materials lent to the workshop by various commercial producers, and supervised instruction by peer teachers in developing special materials for the students each teacher will be meeting the following week.

During the school year, the following activities take place:

1. During the first week of school, a peer teacher spends at least half a day in each classroom when individualized instruction is being introduced.
2. For one day every other week the teacher is observed in her classroom and is given immediate feedback, visits the classroom of another teacher, is given free time to develop materials or read about research or practice in this area, or meets with other teachers in a small discussion group.

The training staff for this workshop should consist of individuals who have had intimate experience in the development or use of individualized instruction or materials. It is desirable that many of these individuals be peer or master teachers; they should be used to train the teachers, but at the same time they should be training future trainers. They should also identify some teachers who can assume leadership or resource roles.

Evaluation and Follow-up Observations, teacher interviews and videotapes could be used to evaluate the success of this workshop effort. If to a great extent (1) teachers express their fears and concerns about employing innovative practices, (2) participate fully in the orientation activities, (3) are self-critical and offer their peers constructive suggestions for improvement, (4) modify existing methods and materials as they are faced with actual classroom situations, (5) introduce individualized instruction without disorienting their students, (6) can implement suggestions for changes in their practice easily without personal stress, etc., then the workshop can be considered successful. There is no need in evaluating the workshop to do anything more than to gather unrefined observational data.

Dissemination The activities of this workshop can be disseminated throughout the school year through the interaction of participating teachers with others in their schools. In addition, at the outset videotapes or audiotapes should be made of teachers using individualized instruction methods during the week of orientation and the school year, for the experiences could be used in subsequent workshops. If this school district plans to introduce individualized instruction on a large scale, it has a body of further training materials if care is taken to adequately record these initial experiences; this is probably the most targeted dissemination that this first workshop could have.

Prototype III

Hypothetical Situation An inner-city district superintendent has found a great deal of discontent among principals and teachers in the elementary schools in his district. Because of mandates from the central board of education, he has had to transfer some of them to other schools to achieve racial balance; principals' and teachers' professional organizations have been meeting to formulate strategies to oppose further transfers. In other communities, parent organizations are meeting to form pressure groups both to oppose and demand pupil transfer. Throughout the previous year, although the district schools have received the newest teaching materials and class sizes have been reduced, more and more teachers have voiced discontent about their feelings of powerlessness teaching in big-city schools where decisions that intimately affect what goes on in their classrooms are made without consulting them in any way. What is more, although unarticulated, there seems to be divisiveness between teachers and principals: teachers attribute discipline and other problems to poor principal leadership, and principals feel that teachers are responsible for the increase in behavior problems and the low reading scores of the schools during the past year.

Among the teachers themselves there is a feeling that the school administration resists any changes, especially if they are initiated by the teachers.

Planning The district superintendent asks the teacher resource training and human relations divisions of the central board to make funds and personnel available for bringing together teachers and principals to join in a workshop to try to understand the etiology of some of their problems and to develop behavioral strategies to solve them. A professor specializing in the problems of urban education volunteers to help plan and conduct this workshop. Several specialists initially interview teachers and principals to discover their problems and to see how they relate to the larger problems of the school system and outside society. These field interviews suggest that both the teachers and principals are unsure of their proper roles in this period of rapid social and educational change and that many of them feel plagued by forces over which they feel they have no control. It is decided that small discussion/workshop groups of teachers and principals will meet every Thursday afternoon for three months to discuss a number of readings on educational and social problems written from various perspectives (historical, professional, participant, etc.) and to analyze some hypothetical problems resembling their own, as revealed by the field interviews. The objectives of the workshop are (1) to stimulate the participants to intellectually understand the etiology of contemporary educational problems and to be aware of the resources available to them to further this increased understanding, (2) to disclose and exchange their feelings and experiences in the schools and critically examine their own and others' behaviors as they begin to perceive them through the discussion of the readings and hypothetical problems, (3) to develop behavioral strategies based on a better perception of the forces that affect their behavior, which will allow them to meet their goals as educators with less conflict or confusion about their own power to control what happens in their classrooms and schools.

Design Each small group consists of ten principals and teachers from the same school and one leader, whose role is only to stimulate the discussion and the development of behavioral strategies. The readings are distributed prior to the meetings, giving the participants adequate time to think about them. During the early meetings the leader encourages the participants to think critically about the ideas in the readings without making direct application to their own situations, but in the later meetings as participants gain greater intellectual understanding of their problems, he encourages these applications. Toward the end of the series of workshop discussions, the participants begin to discuss their own behavioral strategies for dealing with their problems, by themselves alluding to the perceptions gained by thinking critically about the readings. The participants correct or modify other participants' planned changes in behavior according to their different perceptions of the nature of the problems being discussed. Non-participant observers are present at many of these meetings to provide feedback to the groups and to record the nature of the interaction.

Evaluation and Follow-up Observations and teacher interviews can be used to evaluate the success of this workshop effort. If the workshop is successful, the participants (1) will find in the readings issues they want to discuss, (2) suggest an increased understanding of the etiology of contemporary educational problems, (3) offer opinions that are not exclusively based on prior personal experience, (4) interact meaningfully with other participants in developing behavioral strategies to deal with school problems, and (5) be willing to test new strategies in the school or classroom and be able to evaluate the outcomes. During the workshop, observers, group leaders and participants should keep a written account of their observations both to record changes in participants' perceptions and to have data for making any changes in the workshop design.

Dissemination This type of workshop can be built into the ordinary activities of a given school. A participant at this initial workshop may be interested and talented enough to continue these activities with the participants and other personnel in the school. New readings could be identified and time made available to discuss them. The new workshop leader would use his skills in guiding the discussion so it is not merely a gripe session. There could be an agreement to systematically introduce small changes in the school, using the discussion/workshop meetings to informally evaluate the outcomes. As new problems emerge, new intellectual resources could be identified to help solve them. And the cycle of discussion, critical examination of the issues surrounding the problem, and the formulating and testing of behavioral strategies would begin again.

The Future

Some of the responsibility that has fallen on the desegregation inservice workshop in truth belongs on the teacher education institution. Teachers themselves feel that their colleges and universities have never prepared them for teaching in desegregated schools. They feel that colleges are too far removed from the realities of public school teaching and that many of the now common urban education courses do not prepare the teacher in the use of the methods and materials that the teacher finds herself having to use in the desegregated schools. But even if higher education institutions ideally could forecast and prepare teachers for the changes that will occur when teacher education students enter the schools, and this is not likely, the problem of teacher renewal must be left to inservice education. In no profession can one stop learning, but teachers and other educators have been faced with rapid change in the last ten or fifteen years which they have not been prepared for, and they have not been able to find the concentrated inservice training to help them to adjust to this change. The problem may be that inservice training in skills development has tended to be fragmented, what U.S. Commissioner of Education Marland calls the appropriation of funds which allows educators "to tinker with bits and pieces of innovation." The reports of the desegregation inservice workshops held under the 1964 Civil Rights Act are clear proofs that funds have been used to jump on educational bandwagons for a brief time without adequate investigation and planning for the introduction of innovation, without sensitive and carefully observed instruction in the use of the innovation, and without systematic evaluation over a long period of time after the successful introduction of the innovation into the classroom. There may be a question about

whether desegregation workshops should concentrate on skills development so single-mindedly, but in the past they have, and it is likely they will continue to do so in the future, so it is necessary to plan for the best use of available funds.

But the critical issues for the desegregation workshop in the future may not exclusively be skills development, nor the improvement of interpersonal relationships or racial-cultural understanding. The rapid social and educational change which accompanied racial desegregation has made school people unsure of their social and school roles. Too many of them feel they are plagued by forces over which they have no control and which affect their classroom behavior. The problems of school people today have to do with relationships between administrators and teachers, teachers and students, and teachers among themselves; they have to do with feelings of powerlessness and alienation in the school and society; and inservice education has never confronted these problems. To use the analogy of sex education, much inservice education has dealt with the mechanics of sexuality (birth control, prevention of venereal disease, etc.) and not the nature of love and passion. School people need a supportive atmosphere where they can examine and consider some of the complex problems of being an educator. "Renewal" can not only be learning new teaching techniques; educators have to be renewed spiritually as well as mechanically.

Regardless of the workshop—summer institute, year-long training in a resource center, sensitivity training, etc.—the experience fades quickly because of the contradiction between the workshop experience and what goes on in the school. Unless the school supports and reinforces the workshop learning, sending individuals to workshops for a period of time simply does not bring about the desired behavior change. The school as well as the learner has to be willing to change.

Public-Service Employment
continued from page 3

Public service employment was not part of the War on Poverty because it is usually viewed as a residual measure, a last resort when the private sector of the economy is not functioning properly. Indeed, its major use in this country was during the Great Depression. However, there is much unemployment even when the economy is thought to be functioning quite well.

What we call "full employment" is really only relatively full employment. Our lowest official unemployment rate during the past decade was 3.5% in 1969, a level which government economic advisors considered too inflationary to maintain. At the present size of the labor force, an unemployment rate of 3.5% would still leave approximately 2.9 million persons out of work.[1] In some respects, this number overestimates the long-term unemployed, and in others it underestimates the problem. Perhaps half of the official unemployment is "frictional unemployment" (i.e., short-term joblessness resulting from shifts in consumer demand, worker-initiated job change, seasonal fluctuations in operations, etc.). On the other hand, official unemployment rates leave out those who have ceased to look for work because they have no hope of finding a job. Nor do official counts include the number who are under-employed, that is, forced to take seasonal or part-time work. When the under-employed and discouraged workers are considered, the true unemployment rate in inner-city areas is nearly three times that of the official nationwide unemployment figures.[2] Thus, even when the economy is functioning exceptionally well, as measured by official unemployment rates, the employment needs of many—particularly the young and the disadvantaged of all ages—are unmet.

Since the nation has a chronic shortage of jobs during times of expansion and recession, anti-poverty programs must always define economic opportunity as additional employment opportunities. Even if unemployment had not increased as much as it has in the past four years, many graduates of War-on-Poverty training programs would still have found themselves jobless, or perhaps overtrained for marginal work.

Growing Recognition of Need for PSE

If the War on Poverty failed to combat poverty by creating work, it did demonstrate what might have been learned during the Depression: that there is much useful work in the human services, in day-care centers, hospitals, schools, and other social agencies, that can be done well, indeed with dedication and inspiration, by the poor themselves. As we have noted, paraprofessionals, neighborhood workers, or human-service aides were employed in poverty programs to make services more compatible with the needs and life styles of disadvantaged clientele. But a number of observers, notably Frank Riessman and Arthur Pearl, recognized, even in times of economic expansion, that the employment and service goals of our society must be combined. We need more, as well as better, services, and we can have both, as well as more jobs. As early as 1965, Riessman and Pearl proposed the creation of one million "new careers for the poor," jobs which performed vital services but also had the potential for training and eventual upgrading.[3]

During the Johnson years, two distinguished national commissions endorsed the idea of public service employment. Fiscal as well as service goals account for the recommendation of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, that 5.3 million jobs in vital human services be created by government initiative.[4] These twin goals of putting people to work and enhancing human services seemed a good idea to the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (Kerner Commission). In 1968, when riot rates were high and unemployment rates low, the Kerner Commission recommended that Government finance one million public service jobs over a three-year period.[5]

Late last year a group of distinguished leaders in the fields of manpower, employment, and human service formed the National Conference on Public Service Employment (NCPSE). Although it was a time of high unemployment, this group stressed that public service employment is a value in itself, that it was not merely a last resort. The private sector, they maintained, is not able to fulfill either the employment needs or the service needs of society. An economy disproportionately devoted to goods production not only fails to provide work for large numbers of persons but is both environmentally destructive and inadequately responsive to human-welfare needs. The National Conference is therefore committed to a program of public service employment that meets the following criteria:

...[is] of a sufficiently large scale; response to consumers of these services; offers jobs, career and advancement opportunities to persons at all levels of formal training and education; maintains and improves the ecological well being of the environment; and promotes the humane growth of its inhabitants.[6]

The Emergency Employment Act of 1971

Despite growing recognition that public service employment should not be confined to periods of recession, public policy still maintains the fiction that it is unnecessary in good times. It is thus only an apparent anomaly that the Nixon Administration became the first since the New Deal to sponsor a general public employment act. Reversing his earlier stand against "W.P.A.-type jobs," the President urged passage of an Emergency Employment Act, which called for an investment of $2.25 billion in the creation of 140,000 public service jobs.

As its name implies, the EEA is a temporary measure, only triggered when unemployment rises above 4.5% for three or more consecutive months. The bulk of the $1.0 billion authorized in Fiscal Year 1972 is reserved for general grants to units of State and local governments with populations over 75,000. Supplementary assistance is also available to local areas experiencing especially high (six percent) unemployment. Although intended to provide approximately 140,000 job slots, it will result in an even smaller number than that. The legislation stipulates hiring preferences go to previous participants in manpower programs and to Vietnam-era veterans, of whom there are approximately 350,000 unemployed.

Serving at most two percent of the officially unemployed, EEA will undoubtedly have a minimal impact on poverty. The lowest seasonally adjusted unemployment rate for any month in 1972 was 5.5% or approximately 4.5 million jobless! Thus the Administration's approach, though an important recognition of the need for public service employment in periods of high unemployment, not only fails to acknowledge the nation's chronic inability to provide work for all who need it, but operates inadequately as a temporary, emergency measure.

Public Service Employment Proposals: Criteria for Evaluation

Promising, but surprisingly unnoticed, legislative proposals seek to broaden, expand, or extend the EEA. In a review of this legislation for a National Conference on Public Service Employment, Alan Gartner stressed that the two major criteria for evaluating PSE proposals should be permanence and size.[7] Also important are such factors as hiring preferences for the disadvantaged, community participation, and potential for upgrading.

Size and Permanence

It is not only important that a PSE program be large enough to make a dent in the unemployment problem; it should also be viewed as a permanent measure rather than a temporary expedient. Is government to be the "employer of last resort," only activated to bale out the private sector when it temporarily falters? Or is it, in Michael Harrington's phrase, the "employer of *first* resort," a permanent source of vital jobs to deal with the nation's ongoing social needs?[8] If we consider these PSE jobs a true public service, then they should not come and go with rises and dips in the unemployment rates. Although none of the pending bills would create enough jobs or services, all major proposals would significantly expand the insufficient emergency measures we are now taking. Some are triggered by a designated high level of unemployment, but at least one bill calls for a large number of permanent jobs.

Hiring Preferences

Another important factor to be considered in public service employment is that of hiring preferences. Poverty and unemployment will not be countered unless the economically disadvantaged have top priority as applicants for public service employment. The EEA and several of the pending bills draw fire from advocates of the poor and women's rights groups because they give preference to Vietnam-era veterans. Although some legislators feel that passage is more likely if bills seek to aid veterans, the preference for veterans is sexist; less than one percent of Vietnam-era veterans are women. If sufficiently large numbers of jobs are created and are earmarked for the economically disadvantaged, then large numbers of the poor, including those who are Vietnam-era veterans, will be served. Given a preference for the disadvantaged, a large program will tend to obviate discrimination against various subgroups of the poor. A desirable handling of the problem of hiring preferences would be a stipulation such as "jobs should be distributed on an equitable basis among significant segments of the population unemployed."

Community Participation

It is important that organizations representing disadvantaged groups have a voice in the implementation of PSE programs. Among the proposed devices for achieving community participation are community advisory committees and mandated consultation by prime sponsors of jobs with community-action and similar groups in the areas served. One measure calls for the establishment of PSE councils with one-third representation by community organizations, job and service providers, and organizations representing low-income groups.

Upgrading

Despite much lipservice about new "careers," most paraprofessionals have not been significantly upgraded in their new jobs. It is not enough for legislative proposals to allude to upgrading, new careers, and training, as desirable. In any public service employment program these features must be mandatory, lest the new jobs become new treadmills.

PSE and Welfare

There is reason to fear that public service employment may be turned into a punitive anti-relief measure. If the nation's leaders can piously preach workfare, even as they are creating unemployment, we must consciously seek to avoid what NCPSE Chairman, Professor Russell Nixon, called, "turning an opportunity into a club." At its first Board meeting in December 1971, the NCPSE condemned the "wholesale use of discriminatory government-sponsored programs of forced labor and work relief." The fact is that some advocates of public service employment are not sufficiently wary of

combining PSE with welfare reform. Yet, this is precisely the combination that proponents of PSE should resist.

It is important to recognize that PSE is intended to prevent unemployment, not welfare. Indeed, it is no substitute for welfare. Even if opportunities are available for all who are able to work, there will be those who are unemployable—the aged, the disabled, the blind, and those who wish to perform the vital human service of giving full-time care to their children during the preschool years. For these groups, public service employment is no substitute for income maintenance (e.g., a guaranteed income).

Political expediency could lead to legislation that would treat public service employment as a disguised form of relief. We can best avert this outcome if we recognize that public service employment can be vital work; indeed it is far more attuned to human needs than many current jobs in the private sector. We need the services of public service employees as much as they need their jobs.

PSE and Poverty

Even if PSE met all the other desirable criteria we have outlined above, it could still perpetuate poverty by paying inadequate wages. It could merely serve to increase what is really a national scandal: not the "welfare mess" but the fact that large numbers of workers earn income below the poverty level, much less at the level of decency.

Poverty would not be prevented if, for example, PSE employers were required only to meet the Federal minimum wage, for the present Federal standard of $1.65 an hour, or $3,432 per annum, results in income that falls below the meager SSA standard, which is considered far too low by many experts on income maintenance. (See footnote 2, p. 11.) PSE could follow existing guidelines that perpetuate deprivation, or it could lead the way toward an anti-poverty wage.

Financing PSE

In periods of fiscal conservatism, PSE spending is likely to be viewed as particularly spendthrift. Even the EEA was to cost over two billion dollars. Yet, there is some reason to expect that expenditures would be at least partially self-liquidating, in that they will ultimately bring money back to the Treasury. Increased earning leads to more consumption and more jobs, all of which augment tax revenues. It has been estimated that the creation of 500,000 PSE jobs would have a multiplier effect four to five times that amount—that is, from two to two and one-half million new jobs.

PSE will have a multiplier effect unless its expansionist thrust is contravened by concurrent cuts in government spending. If legislation is not properly safe-guarded, funds which go to state and local governments for PSE might simply permit these hard-pressed units to pay for current services with Federal funds. Legislation must very clearly require that grants be used to create *additional* jobs, that funds cannot be used to finance existing programs. Nor should the creation of new jobs be accompanied by cuts in existing ones. Employment in public service must be expanded, not merely financed differently. PSE can be a form of revenue sharing, but one that permits expansion of services rather than the maintenance of present levels.

Publicizing Public Service Employment

Despite the importance of the unemployment issue, electoral politics has failed to stimulate public interest in public service employment. But, even without public pressure, it seems likely that one or more of the major PSE bills will be reported out of committee and will reach the Senate or House floor in the near future.

It is unfortunate that neither the general public, the disadvantaged, nor even those who advocate their interests are well informed about public service employment. Both the public-policy aspects of the issue and status of current legislation remain the province of a relatively small number of experts. At the National Conference on Public Service Employment, which was attended by manpower specialists, anti-poverty workers, and representatives of minority-rights groups, participants seemed to confuse manpower and training programs with public service employment. Even before a group that should have been knowledgeable, it was necessary for Frank Riessman to take the floor to emphasize that this legislation proposes jobs, not training programs. One million public service jobs, or even half that number, he maintained, would be a significant program.

Those who seek to equalize opportunity should familiarize themselves with legislation that would truly expand employment and public services. It is important that we know which proposals would lead to the most services and jobs—on a permanent basis. In addition, the poor will benefit most if we amend pending bills so that they give hiring preferences to all the economically disadvantaged—require that jobs provide the potential for upgrading; and mandate the participation of the beneficiaries in the administration of the program. Above all, PSE must be separate from welfare and income-maintenance measures and must provide an anti-poverty wage.

PSE proposals need to be discussed, debated, and publicized. Those of us in touch with disadvantaged groups can inform them of pending legislation and, to assure passage of strong measures, of the criteria by which these proposals should be judged. Participation by potential beneficiaries at this stage will facilitate more adequate legislation and will stimulate maximum use of PSE opportunities when they become available.

In the field of public service employment there has been encouraging legislative initiative but inadequate support from the disadvantaged and their advocates. This is partly the legacy of an anti-poverty program which heralded "economic opportunity" but failed to come to grips with the nation's chronic job shortages. The poor need higher quality education, housing, and medical care; they should get these services for no other reason than that of justice or of reducing inequality. But such attempts to improve the disadvantaged conditions of individuals will not in themselves provide an escape from poverty unless the most obvious economic opportunities are available: sufficient jobs at decent pay. PSE defines economic opportunity as the chance to earn an adequate wage and to perform a valuable service to the community. Efforts to bring Congressional sponsors and potential beneficiaries of PSE legislation closer together would thus help to create a new anti-poverty coalition—one that attempts to meet the economic needs of the poor and the social needs of all citizens.

Footnotes

[1]According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the October 1972 rate, seasonally adjusted, was 5.5%

[2]As part of the 1970 Census, the Bureau of Labor Statists (BLS) of the Department of Labor surveyed fifty-one urban areas to determine subemployment, an index which includes not only discouraged and under-employed workers but full-time workers who fail to earn enough to maintain a lower-level decent standard of living ($6,690 for a family of four in the average urban area according to the BLS). In these fifty-one areas, which are typical not only of ghettoes but of about one-third of the urban population, sixty percent are subemployed, that is, unable to attain the BLS standard. Thirty percent fall below the far more meager standard of $4,000 which the Social Security Administration (SSA) has computed by tripling the cost of a very minimal food budget. The subemployment findings are reported in: William Spring, Bennett Harrison, and Thomas Vietorisz, "Crisis of the *Under*employed: In Much of the Inner City 60% Don't Earn Enough for a Decent, Low-level Standard of Living," *New York Times Magazine*, November 5, 1972, p. 42.

[3]Arthur Pearl and Frank Riessman, *New Careers for the Poor: The Nonprofessional in Human Service*, New York: The Free Press, 1965. For a review of subsequent developments in this field see Gertrude S. Goldberg, "New Nonprofessionals in the Human Services: An Overview," in *Nonprofessionals in the Human Services*, edited by Charles F. Grosser, William E. Henry, and James G. Kelly. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1969, pp. 12-65.

[4]Howard R. Bowen and Garth Mangum (eds.), *Automation and Economic Progress. A Summary of the National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress.* New York: Prentice-Hall, 1966. The Commission suggested a 5-year program, beginning with the creation of 500,000 new jobs in public service employment.

[5]*Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.* New York: Bantam Books, 1968, p. 420.

[6]Preamble Bi-Laws, National Conference on Public Service Employment, December 6, 1971. The NCPSE is located at 358 Broadway, New York City 10013. It provides various kinds of information on PSE, including a Bulletin. A forthcoming publication, *Public Service Employment: An Analysis of Its History, Problems, and Prospects* (edited by Alan Gartner, Russell A. Nixon, and Frank Riessman; Praeger, February 1963) contains articles by leaders in the NCPSE and other experts.

[7]*A Summary and Comparison of the Major Public Service Employment Bills*, Prepared for the National Conference on Public Service Employment for a Legislative Action Conference in Washington, D.C., April 20, 1972. Alan Gartner is Secretary of the NCPSE.

[8]Michael Harrington, "Government Should Be the Employer of *First* Resort," *New York Times Magazine*, March 26, 1972, p. 44.

ERIC/IRCD PUBLICATIONS

Single copies of the following publications are available free of charge from ERIC/IRCD, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027.

IRCD BULLETINS

Vol. V, No. 4 **Education, Ethnicity, Genetics and Intelligence**, Edmund W. Gordon, Carol Lopate, Jerry Hirsch, Benjamin S. Bloom, Allan C. Goldstein, and Howard E. Gruber. 24p., Fall 1969.

Vol. VI, Nos. 1 & 2 **Media for Teaching Afro-American Studies**, Adelaide Jablonsky. 23p., Spring-Summer 1970.

Vol. VI, No. 3 **Bodies, Brains and Poverty: Poor Children and the Schools**, Joan Dye Gussow; **Recommendations for Child Health Care Spelled Out in Special Academy Report**, American Academy of Pediatrics. 20p., September 1970.

Vol. VI, No. 5 **Compensatory Education: Evaluation in Perspective**, Edmund W. Gordon. 12p., December 1970.

Vol. VII, Nos. 1 & 2 **Status Report on Compensatory Education**, Adelaide Jablonsky. 24p., Winter-Spring 1971.

Vol. VII, No. 3 **Directory of Selected Ongoing Compensatory Education Programs**, Adelaide Jablonsky. 20p., Summer 1971.

Vol. VII, No. 5 **Deschooling and the Disadvantaged: Implications of the Illich Proposal**, Gertrude S. Goldberg. 12p., December 1971.

Vol. VIII, No. 1 **Expanding Opportunities in Higher Education: Some Trends and Countertrends**, Judith P. Ruchkin; **Access to Higher Education**, Edmund W. Gordon. 12p., February 1972.

Vol. VIII, No. 2 **There Are Some Good Teachers of the Disadvantaged**, Adelaide Jablonsky. 20p., March 1972

URBAN DISADVANTAGED SERIES

No. 18 **Mutability of Intelligence and Epidemiology of Mild Mental Retardation**, Zena Stein and Mervyn Susser. 41p., September 1970.

No. 26 **Oriental-Americans: An Annotated Bibliography**, Lorna Duphiney. 24p., February 1972.

No. 27 **Busing: Who's Being Taken for a Ride**, Nicolaus Mills. 25p., June 1972.

No. 28 **Human Relations in the Classroom: An Annotated Bibliography: Supplement 1**, Raja Jayatilleke. 102p., June 1972.

No. 29 **An Annotated Bibliography of Selected Books About American Indians for Elementary Through High School Students**, Loretta Z. Revai. 69p., July 1972.

No. 30 **The Exemplary Teacher of the Disadvantaged: Two Views**, Adelaide Jablonsky. 38p., July 1972.

No. 31 **Women: Their Educational and Career Roles, An Annotated Bibliography of Selected ERIC References**, Jean Barabas. 66p., August 1972.

New Price for RIE: Effective January 1, 1973, the yearly subscription price for **Research in Education** will be $38.00 domestic, $47.50 foreign; single issues $3.25. Order from Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The editors of the **IRCD Bulletin** invite you to submit original manuscripts of research on the problems of discrimination as they relate to education for possible publication in the **IRCD Bulletin.** Manuscripts should be typewritten and of approximately three to five thousand words in length. Simply address manuscripts or letters of inquiry to Mr. Warren Halliburton, Box 221, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027.

In an effort to help make the work of black artists available to secondary and college level students, ERIC-IRCD in cooperation with the National Center for Research on Equal Educational Opportunity and the Center for Ethnic Studies has prepared in portfolio form, **Black Artists in America.** Included is James A. Porter's essay, *150 Years of Afro-American Art*, which gives both a comprehensive historical overview as well as a rich source of reference materials. Eight display panels (12" x 18") feature sample works and brief sketches of the lives and ideas of contemporary black artists: Selma Burke, Elizabeth Catlett, Ernest Crichlow, Richard Hunt, Lois Mailou Jones, Richard Mayhew, Charles White and Hale Woodruff.

Copies of **Black Artists in America** can be obtained by writing:

Black Artists in America
Horace Mann Lincoln Institute
Box 40
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

A **$2.00** handling charge for each copy requested must be included with each order.

INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER ON THE DISADVANTAGED

The IRCD Bulletin, a publication of the ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged, is published five times a year and usually includes status or interpretive statements, book reviews, and a selected bibliography on the center's special areas. Persons may ask, in writing, to be placed on the subscription list. The center also publishes the ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series and the Collegiate Compensatory Education Series, a series of bibliographies, reviews, and position papers. Numbers in this series will be announced in the IRCD BULLETIN and can be obtained by request. Subject areas covered by IRCD include the effects of disadvantaged enviornments; the academic, intellectual, and social performance of disadvantaged youth; programs and practices which provide learning experiences to compensate for the special problems and build on the characteristics of the disadvantaged; programs related to economic and ethnic discrimination, segregation, desegregation, and integration in education; and materials related to ethnic studies.

The center is operated under a contract with the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) of the U.S. Office of Education and receives additional funds from the College Entrance Examination Board, Teachers College, Columbia University, the Division of Equal Educational Opportunities of the U.S. Office of Education, and other agencies for special services.

Edmund W. Gordon
Director

Erwin Flaxman
Associate Director

HOW TO ORDER
ERIC DOCUMENT REPRODUCTIONS

Purchase from: ERIC Document Reproduction Service
Post Office Drawer 0
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

To enable users to obtain the full text of documents cited in the reports section of the monthly issues of **Research in Education**, ERIC established the ERIC Document Reproduction Service **(EDRS).**

EDRS supplies copies of these ERIC REPORTS in two forms:

- Microfiche (MF)–4" x 6" sheet of microfilm on which up to 70 pages of text are reproduced.
- Hard Copy (HC)– reproduction of the document on paper at the original size.

The correct cost of each document cited in **Research in Education,** both in hard copy and microfiche, appears in all citations after May, 1971. For past issues of **RIE,** individual documents may be ordered at 65 cents per title for fiche and $3.29 for each 100 page increment (101-200 pages, $6.58; 201-300 pages, $9.87; etc.) for orders of hard copy titles. Orders must include the accession number (e.g. ED number), type of reproduction (HC or MF), and the number of copies. Payment must accompany orders under $10.00

To facilitate rapid turn-around for priority requests a "walk-in" order service is available at the EDRS Facility:

Leasco Information Products, Inc.
4827 Rugby Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Monthly standing orders for microfiche copies of all ERIC reports announced in each issue of **Research in Education** average $120 per month, at the reduced rate of 8.9 cents per microfiche. Complete microfiche orders for the special collections are also available at cost savings. Prices for these collections can be obtained by writing directly to ERIC-IRCD.

Prices for these collections can be obtained by writing directly to ERIC-IRCD.

ERIC-IRCD BULLETIN
Edmund W. Gordon–Editor

Teachers College
Columbia University
525 West 120th Street
New York, New York 10027

Volume VIII, Nos. 3 & 4